



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,300	02/22/2002	Thomas Schaeck	RSW920010213US1	3842

7590

01/05/2006

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

KOROBV, VITALI A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,300

Applicant(s)

SCHAECK ET AL.

Examiner

Vitali Korobov

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to the Applicants' amendment filed on 10/27/2005. Claims 1-3, 11-13 were amended. New claims 14-17 were added. Therefore, claims 1-17 are currently pending in this application.

Specification

2. Based on the Applicants' amendment, prior objections to the specification are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The meaning of line 3 of the second paragraph of claim 16 is not clear to the Examiner. For the purposes of this Office Action the Examiner removed the words "is configured" to match the wording of claim 14.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U. S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0009016 by Hofmann et al., (hereinafter Hofmann), in view of the U. S. Patent No. 6,476,833 to Moshfedhi, hereinafter Moshfedhi.

Regarding claim 1, Hofmann teaches a method of providing role-specific views of an aggregated service in a computing network, the aggregated service comprising one or more software resources, the method comprising: providing a role-specific portlet for each role supported by a particular one of the one or more software resources (Fig. 3, role-specific portlets 115, 116 and 117 for particular software resources 101A, 101C and RDF data, respectively); providing linkage between the role-specific portlets and the roles for the particular one of the software resources (Fig. 3, links between items 115 and 101A, 117 and 101C, and 116 and RDF data); repeating providing a role-specific portlet and providing linkage between the role-specific portlets and the roles for the particular one of the software resources for each of the one or more software resources (Fig. 2B, "Yes" loop-back from the decision box 289; see also §0094 – repeat of selection operation as appropriate); obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service (§0061 – user role is determined as a result of his

request (run time) based of the user's demands or wishes); and using the obtained role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the role-specific portlets for each of the software resources, thereby providing the role-specific view of the aggregated service (Fig. 2B – process flow diagram of programmatic selection of role-specific portlets. See also §0088 for a detailed description of the process 280).

Even though Hofmann teaches role-specific portlets (i.e. mail portlet, RDF portlet, etc.), Hofmann does not explicitly teach the amended limitations of claim 1, namely these portlets being user role-specific.

However, Moshfedhi in analogous art, directed to customizing (restricting and filtering) user access to allowed network resources, teaches user role-specific views of aggregated service, further providing a user role-specific browser functionality, which is essentially the same as portlet functionality, and therefore providing linkage between the user role-specific portlets and the user roles for the particular one of the software resources for each of the one or more software resources. (Moshfedhi, col. 7, lines 39-67 and col. 8, lines 1-8, where each user is presented with user role-specific aggregation of application software and embedded browser (portlet) functionality. See also col. 3, lines 25-41 for Moshfedhi's teachings on providing linkage between the user role-specific browser configurations (which in modified Moshfedhi may be portlets) and the user roles for the particular one of the software resources for each of the one or more software resources).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement Moshfedhi's teachings of embedded

browser window with the teachings of Hofmann on portlets in order to provide additional measure of customization to the embedded browser window of Moshfedhi. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the teaching of Hofmann on providing role-specific views of an aggregated service to the user with the teaching of Moshfedhi on providing user role-specific views of an aggregated service to the user for the same reason, i. e. to provide additional measure of customization in providing view of an aggregated service to a user.

Regarding claim 2, Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1; further comprising rendering the selected user role-specific view for the user (§0060 – presentation manager renders information to the user device. Moshfedhi, col. 7, lines 39-67 and col. 8, lines 1-8, where each user is presented with user role-specific aggregation of application software and embedded browser (portlet functionality).

Regarding claim 3, Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein using the obtained user role further comprises: determining which of the one or more software resources should be invoked to position the user's entry point into the aggregated service (Fig. 2B – decision 286 – determination (selection) of a portlet (entry point into the aggregated service) based on the MIME type); and using the obtained user role to programmatically select a user role-specific view of the determined software resource (§0077 – selection of the mail service

as an example of the role-specific view of the determined software resource, and Moshfedhi, col. 7, lines 39-67 and col. 8, lines 1-8).

Regarding claim 4, Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user (Moshfedhi, col. 4, lines 12-32).

Regarding claim 5, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the user role is determined using the user's identification and credentials (Moshfedhi, col. 7, lines 51-67).

Regarding claim 6, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein user role information is programmatically relayed among distributed services performed by the software resources of the aggregated service (Moshfedhi, col. 8, lines 2-8, where Moshfedhi teaches that user information may be relayed to distributed services via LDAP).

Regarding claim 9, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the linkage uses XML Linking language ("XLink") syntax (Hofmann, §0072 – XML and Moshfedhi, col. 16 - section 3.2 - XLink Overview).

Regarding claim 10, the Hofmann/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the linkage is stored in a portlet archive ("PAR") file (Hofmann, §0025 – storage).

Claims 11 and 12 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 1 and differ from said claim one only in statutory category. Claims 11 and 12 set forth the invention as a system and a computer-readable media, respectively, rather

than a method, as does claim 1, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale as the above rejected claim 1.

Claim 13 does not teach or define any new limitations above those of claim 1-3, and therefore is rejected for similar reasons as said claims 1-3.

Regarding claim 14, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to Claim 1, wherein: obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service comprises assigning a consumer role as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be a consumer and assigning an administrator role as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be an administrator (Moshfedhi, col. 4, lines 12-31 - user role is determined at run time, wherein upon authentication of a user, user profile is loaded, said user profile comprising user role definition parameters, as per col. 7, lines 51-67. Here Moshfedhi teaches a role of a patient, which the Examiner interprets as consumer. Throughout his disclosure, Moshfedhi also teaches a role of an administrator (see, for example, col. 3, lines 20-25); and using the obtained user role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources provides a consumer-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be a consumer and provides an administrator-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be an administrator (Moshfedhi, col. 4, lines 12-32).

Regarding claim 15, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the system of Claim 11, wherein: the means for obtaining, at run time, a user role corresponding to a user of the aggregated service comprises means for assigning a consumer role as the

user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be a consumer and means for assigning an administrator role as the user role when the user of the aggregated service is determined to be an administrator (Moshfedhi, col. 4, lines 12-31 - user role is determined at run time, wherein upon authentication of a user, user profile is loaded, said user profile comprising user role definition parameters, as per col. 7, lines 51-67. Here Moshfedhi teaches a role of a patient, which the Examiner interprets as consumer. Throughout his disclosure, Moshfedhi also teaches a role of an administrator (see, for example, col. 3, lines 20-25); and the means for using the obtained user role to programmatically select a corresponding one of the user role-specific portlets for each of the software resources provides a consumer-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be a consumer and provides an administrator-specific view of the aggregated service when the user is determined to be an administrator (Moshfedhi, col. 4, lines 12-32).

Claim 16 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 and differs from said claim 14 only in statutory category. Claim 16 sets forth the invention as a computer-readable media, rather than a method, as does claim 14, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale as the above rejected claim 14.

Claim 17 does not teach or define any new limitations above those of claim 14-16, and therefore is rejected for similar reasons as said claims 14-16.

5. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofmann in view of Moshfedhi, and further in view of the U. S. Patent 6,920,461 to Hejlsberg et al., hereinafter Hejlsberg.

Regarding claim 7, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi combination teaches the method according to claim 6, but fails to teach explicitly the method wherein the programmatic relaying comprises sending a message which specifies the user role in a header of the message and in which a body of the message identifies that this message is delivering the user role.

However, Hejlsberg in analogous art, related to providing web services, teaches the method wherein the programmatic relaying comprises sending a message which specifies the user role in a header of the message and in which a body of the message identifies that this message is delivering the user role. (Hejlsberg, Col. 3, lines 40-44 – remote calls and SOAP/XML invocations. The limitations of claim 7 are met by the format of SOAP message header and SOAP envelope).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hofmann and Hejlsberg in order to further facilitate the shift to the distributed computing environment (Hejlsberg, Col. 2, lines 22 – 32).

Regarding claim 8, the Hofmann/Moshfedhi/Hejlsberg combination teaches the method according to claim 7, wherein the message is a SOAP ("Simple Object Access Protocol") message (Hejlsberg, Col. 3, lines 40-44 – remote calls and SOAP/XML invocations).

6. **Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part

Art Unit: 2155

of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, necessitated by the Applicant's amendment.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vitali Korobov whose telephone number is 571-272-7506. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 8a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vitali Korobov
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

12/30/2005
VAK


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER